

BPS Black Holes in Gauged N=4, D=4 Supergravity

Dietmar Klemm*

*Università degli Studi di Trento,
Dipartimento di Fisica,
Via Sommarive, 14
38050 Povo (TN)
Italia*

*and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare,
Gruppo Collegato di Trento,
Italia*

Abstract

We find solutions of the bosonic sector of gauged N=4, D=4 $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity, which represent dilaton black holes with toroidal or spherical event horizons. The axion is consistently truncated, and the gauge group is broken to $U(1) \times U(1)$. The spherical black holes carry two electric and two magnetic abelian charges, whereas the toroidal holes have vanishing magnetic charges. The spacetime metrics are warped products, and the manifolds turn out to be globally hyperbolic, in contrast to standard gauged supergravity ground states. It is shown that in the toroidal case, there are solutions preserving one quarter or one half of the supersymmetries, while for spherical topologies all supersymmetries are broken. In general, the toroidal BPS states represent naked singularities, but there is also a supersymmetric black hole with vanishing Hawking temperature. The 1/2 supersymmetric case arises for vanishing charges and mass, and represents the known domain wall solution of the Freedman-Schwarz model. It provides the background in which the black holes live. Finally, we use Chamseddine's and Volkov's Kaluza-Klein interpretation of gauged N=4, D=4 $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity to lift our solutions to ten and eleven dimensions and to consider them as solutions to

*email: klemm@science.unitn.it

the leading order equations of motion of the string-/M-theory effective action.

04.65.+e, 04.70.-s, 04.50.+h, 04.60.-m

I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, gauged supergravity theories have regained considerable interest, which is mainly based on the AdS/CFT correspondence [1–3], providing a duality between supergravity on AdS backgrounds and certain superconformal field theories living on the boundary of AdS. One of these supergravity theories is the gauged $N=4$, $D=4$ $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ version of Freedman and Schwarz [4]. Lately, Chamseddine and Volkov discovered that this model has a Kaluza-Klein interpretation [5,6], more precisely that it can be obtained from $N=1$ supergravity in ten dimensions by compactifying on the group manifold $S^3 \times S^3$. This allows to lift known solutions to ten or eleven dimensions, and thus to regard them as solutions to the low energy effective action of string- or M-theory. In this way, one can find new, unconventional solutions of the higher dimensional supergravity theories.

Of particular interest in this context are the BPS states preserving some amount of supersymmetry, because they allow to study the nonperturbative sector of string theory. Furthermore, they play an important role in giving a microscopic explanation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of some extremal black holes [7].

This motivates to look for new supersymmetric configurations in gauged $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity. This model, which we will refer to as the Freedman-Schwarz (FS) model, is characterized by a dilaton potential which, apart from being unbounded from below, has no critical point, and therefore the theory does not admit a maximally symmetric AdS vacuum. Nevertheless, a stable vacuum state has been found by Freedman and Gibbons [8], which is a product manifold $AdS_2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, and preserves one quarter or one half of the supersymmetries, the latter case occurring if one of the two gauge coupling constants vanishes. In this “electrovac solution”, the dilaton is constant; it is stabilized by turning on an electric field, which determines the radius of the AdS_2 factor. (It is quite interesting to note that later it has been shown that the Freedman-Gibbons vacuum is also an exact solution of string theory, to all orders in α' [9].) There are also other supersymmetric vacua of the Freedman-Schwarz model, in particular the domain wall solution [10,11] preserving one half of the supersymmetries. This solution has vanishing gauge fields, it is purely dilatonic. Furthermore, BPS configurations involving a non-zero axion were found by Singh [11,12], and non-abelian magnetic solitons were discovered by Chamseddine and Volkov [5,6]. Yet, to the author’s knowledge, until now no BPS extremal black hole solutions have been found in the FS model, and to remedy this will be the main purpose of the present paper¹. We will see that such BPS black holes exist only if one admits nontrivial spacetime topology, so the interesting physics of the so-called topological black holes [15–20] will come into play.

The rest of this article is organized as follows:

In section II the model is presented, and in III we construct black hole solutions. Supersymmetry of these solutions will be studied in IV, and in V we shall lift the found BPS states to ten and eleven dimensions.

Finally, our results are summarized and discussed in VI.

¹For BPS black holes in five-dimensional gauged supergravities coupled to vector multiplets, cf. [13,14]

II. GAUGED N=4, D=4 SU(2) × SU(2) SUPERGRAVITY

There are two known versions of ungauged N=4, D=4 supergravity. The first one has a global SO(4) symmetry [21,22], and it is possible to gauge the full SO(4) group [23]. Besides, as was shown by Gates and Zwiebach [24], one can also gauge SU(2) × SU(2), leading to another scalar potential.

The superalgebra of the second ungauged version [25] has an SU(4) automorphism group, and gauging of an SU(2) × SU(2) subgroup of it leads to the Freedman-Schwarz model [4]. It is this model we are interested in, and which we shall present in the following.

The theory contains one graviton $V_\mu^{\alpha 2}$, four Majorana gravitinos ψ_μ^I , six vector fields A_μ^a and B_μ^a ($a = 1, 2, 3$), four spin 1/2 fields χ^I , one dilaton ϕ , and one axion η . The bosonic part of the Lagrangian is [4]³

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{V}{4}R + \frac{V}{2}[\partial^\mu \phi \partial_\mu \phi + \exp(4\phi) \partial^\mu \eta \partial_\mu \eta] + \frac{\Lambda^2}{8}V \exp(2\phi) \\ & -\frac{V}{4}(A_{\mu\nu}^a A^{a\mu\nu} + B_{\mu\nu}^a B^{a\mu\nu}) \exp(-2\phi) - \frac{V}{2}\eta(\tilde{A}_{\mu\nu}^a A^{a\mu\nu} + \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}^a B^{a\mu\nu}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where

$$A_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu A_\nu^a - \partial_\nu A_\mu^a + e_A \epsilon_{abc} A_\mu^b A_\nu^c, \quad (2)$$

$$B_{\mu\nu}^a = \partial_\mu B_\nu^a - \partial_\nu B_\mu^a + e_B \epsilon_{abc} B_\mu^b B_\nu^c, \quad (3)$$

$$\tilde{A}_{\mu\nu}^a = \frac{1}{2V} \epsilon_{\mu\nu}^{\rho\sigma} A_{\rho\sigma}^a. \quad (4)$$

e_A and e_B denote the gauge coupling constants, and

$$\Lambda^2 = e_A^2 + e_B^2. \quad (5)$$

The supersymmetry transformations for a purely bosonic background read

$$\delta \bar{\chi} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\epsilon} (\partial_\mu \phi + i\gamma_5 \exp(2\phi) \partial_\mu \eta) \gamma^\mu - \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\phi) \bar{\epsilon} C_{\mu\nu} \sigma^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4} \exp(\phi) \bar{\epsilon} (e_A + i\gamma_5 e_B), \quad (6)$$

$$\delta \bar{\psi}_\rho = \bar{\epsilon} (\overleftarrow{D}_\rho - \frac{i}{2} \exp(2\phi) \gamma_5 \partial_\rho \eta) - \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \exp(-\phi) \bar{\epsilon} C_{\mu\nu} \gamma_\rho \sigma^{\mu\nu} + \frac{i}{4\sqrt{2}} \exp(\phi) \bar{\epsilon} (e_A + i\gamma_5 e_B) \gamma_\rho, \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon = \epsilon^I$ are four Majorana spinors. The Lorentz- and gauge covariant derivative is given by

$$\overleftarrow{D}_\rho = \overleftarrow{\partial}_\rho - \frac{1}{2} \omega_\rho^{\alpha\beta} \sigma_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} e_A \alpha^a A_\rho^a + \frac{1}{2} e_B \beta^a B_\rho^a, \quad (8)$$

²Early greek letters refer to the tangent space, whereas late ones denote world indices.

³Our Lagrangian results from that in [4] by setting $K = 1$.

the α^a and β^a denoting the generators of the $(1/2, 1/2)$ representation of $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ (we shall use the matrices given in [4]). Furthermore we defined

$$C_{\mu\nu} = \alpha^a A_{\mu\nu}^a + i\gamma_5 \beta^a B_{\mu\nu}^a. \quad (9)$$

Our conventions are as follows: The metric signature is mostly minus $(+ - - -)$, $\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2g_{\mu\nu}$, $\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{4}[\gamma_\alpha, \gamma_\beta]$, $\gamma_5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$, so that $\gamma_5^2 = 1$. We use the representation

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \gamma_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_1 \\ -\sigma_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \gamma_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_2 \\ -\sigma_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \gamma_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma_3 \\ -\sigma_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the two-dimensional Pauli matrices are given by

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

III. BLACK HOLE SOLUTIONS

Now we are interested in purely bosonic background solutions of the FS model, which represent black holes. For the time being, we shall limit ourselves to the zero axion case. To see if this is a consistent truncation, one has to consider the axion equation of motion following from (1), which is given by

$$\partial_\mu(V \exp(4\phi)\partial^\mu\eta) + \frac{V}{2}(\tilde{A}_{\mu\nu}^a A^{a\mu\nu} + \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}^a B^{a\mu\nu}) = 0. \quad (12)$$

The consistency condition for zero axion therefore reads

$$\tilde{A}_{\mu\nu}^a A^{a\mu\nu} + \tilde{B}_{\mu\nu}^a B^{a\mu\nu} = 0. \quad (13)$$

The remaining equations of motion for the metric, the dilaton, and the gauge fields are, respectively

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}Rg_{\mu\nu} &= -g_{\mu\nu}\partial_\rho\phi\partial^\rho\phi + 2\partial_\mu\phi\partial_\nu\phi - \frac{\Lambda^2}{4}\exp(2\phi)g_{\mu\nu} \\ &\quad - 2\exp(-2\phi)\left[A_{\mu\rho}^a A_\nu^{a\rho} + B_{\mu\rho}^a B_\nu^{a\rho} - \frac{1}{4}(A_{\rho\sigma}^a A^{a\rho\sigma} + B_{\rho\sigma}^a B^{a\rho\sigma})g_{\mu\nu}\right], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{1}{V}\partial_\mu(V\partial^\mu\phi) = \frac{1}{2}\exp(-2\phi)(A_{\rho\sigma}^a A^{a\rho\sigma} + B_{\rho\sigma}^a B^{a\rho\sigma}) + \frac{\Lambda^2}{4}\exp(2\phi), \quad (15)$$

$$0 = \partial_\mu(V \exp(-2\phi)A^{a\mu\nu}) = \partial_\mu(V \exp(-2\phi)B^{a\mu\nu}). \quad (16)$$

Now for the metric we make the warped product ansatz

$$ds^2 = f(r)dt^2 - f(r)^{-1}dr^2 - R^2(r)d\Omega_k^2, \quad (17)$$

where $d\Omega_k^2$ denotes the metric on a two-dimensional compact surface Σ_k , which we assume to be of constant curvature k . Without loss of generality, we can restrict ourselves to the values $k = 0, 1, -1$, referring to a torus, a sphere, and a Riemann surface of genus $g > 1$, respectively. For $k = 1$, the ansatz (17) has been used previously by Chan, Horne and Mann [26] to find spherical black holes in Einstein-Maxwell-dilaton gravity, which carry either electric or magnetic charge. Later, for purely electric charge, these black hole solutions were generalized by Cai, Ji and Soh to the cases $k = 0, -1$ [27], leading to the so-called topological dilaton black holes.

We assume that the dilaton depends on the coordinate r only, $\phi = \phi(r)$. Furthermore we break the gauge group $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ to $U(1) \times U(1)$, setting

$$A_\mu^a = A_\mu \delta^{a3}, \quad B_\mu^a = B_\mu \delta^{a3}. \quad (18)$$

From (2) then follows

$$A_{\mu\nu}^a = (\partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu) \delta^{a3} \equiv A_{\mu\nu} \delta^{a3}, \quad (19)$$

with a similar equation for $B_{\mu\nu}^a$. The gauge field equations of motion (16) are satisfied, if one sets

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \frac{Q_A}{R^2} \exp(2\phi) dt \wedge dr + H_A \epsilon, \\ B &= \frac{Q_B}{R^2} \exp(2\phi) dt \wedge dr + H_B \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where ϵ is the volume form on Σ_k , and $Q_{A,B}$, $H_{A,B}$ are the electric and magnetic charge parameters, respectively. The consistency condition for zero axion (13) then reads

$$Q_A H_A + Q_B H_B = 0. \quad (21)$$

Using the ansatz (17) and defining

$$Q^2 = Q_A^2 + Q_B^2, \quad H^2 = H_A^2 + H_B^2, \quad (22)$$

the equation of motion (15) for the dilaton becomes

$$\frac{1}{R^2} [R^2 f \phi']' + \frac{\Lambda^2}{4} \exp(2\phi) + \frac{H^2}{R^4} \exp(-2\phi) - \frac{Q^2}{R^4} \exp(2\phi) = 0, \quad (23)$$

where the prime denotes the derivative with respect to r . (14) yields the equations for the metric

$$-\frac{f''}{2} - \frac{R' f'}{R} - \frac{2R'' f}{R} = 2f\phi'^2 - \frac{\Lambda^2}{4} \exp(2\phi) - \frac{H^2}{R^4} \exp(-2\phi) - \frac{Q^2}{R^4} \exp(2\phi), \quad (24)$$

$$-\frac{f''}{2} - \frac{R' f'}{R} = -\frac{\Lambda^2}{4} \exp(2\phi) - \frac{H^2}{R^4} \exp(-2\phi) - \frac{Q^2}{R^4} \exp(2\phi), \quad (25)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2R^2} [(R^2)' f] + \frac{k}{R^2} = -\frac{\Lambda^2}{4} \exp(2\phi) + \frac{H^2}{R^4} \exp(-2\phi) + \frac{Q^2}{R^4} \exp(2\phi). \quad (26)$$

Subtracting (25) from (24), we get

$$\frac{R''}{R} = -\phi'^2. \quad (27)$$

Now we make the ansatz

$$R(r) = \gamma r^N, \quad (28)$$

used in [26,27], and obtain from (27)

$$\phi(r) = \phi_0 \pm \sqrt{N(1-N)} \ln r. \quad (29)$$

The remaining system to solve consists then of eqns. (23), (25) and (26). It turns out that solutions exist either for $N = 0$ or for $N = 1/2$. In both cases we only obtain spherical or toroidal topologies, i. e. $k = 1$ or $k = 0$, but we do not find Riemann surfaces with genus $g > 1$. Maybe such solutions exist in the two other gauged versions of N=4, D=4 supergravity [23,24], as they have other scalar potentials, but we shall leave this issue for future investigations.

For $N = 0$, the solutions read

$$H^2 = \frac{k\gamma^2 C}{2}, \quad 4Q^2 = \Lambda^2 \gamma^4 + \frac{2k\gamma^2}{C}, \quad f(r) = c_1 + c_2 r + \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda^2 C + \frac{2k}{\gamma^2})r^2, \quad (30)$$

where we defined

$$C \equiv \exp(2\phi_0), \quad (31)$$

and $c_{1,2}$ are integration constants. Note that the magnetic charges are related to the curvature k of Σ_k , which implies that $H_{A,B}$ vanish in the toroidal case. The $N = 0$ solutions are product manifolds $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^1 \times S^1$ or $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^2$, and hence represent the Freedman-Gibbons solutions [8], with the AdS_2 factor viewed by an accelerated observer. The horizons determined by the zeros of $f(r)$ therefore are merely acceleration horizons, and not black hole event horizons. As these solutions have been studied extensively in [8], we shall not consider them further, and we will instead devote our attention to the more interesting case $N = 1/2$. We again get the relation

$$H^2 = \frac{k\gamma^2 C}{2}, \quad (32)$$

so that $H = 0$ for toroidal topology. The function $f(r)$ is given by

$$f(r) = \frac{2Q^2 C}{\gamma^4 r} - m + \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda^2 C + \frac{2k}{\gamma^2})r, \quad (33)$$

where m is an integration constant related to the black hole's mass. Furthermore, one has to choose the lower sign in (29).

In general, one has an inner (Cauchy) horizon r_- and an outer (event) horizon r_+ , with

$$r_{\pm} = \frac{m\gamma^2 \pm \sqrt{m^2\gamma^4 - 4Q^2C(\Lambda^2C + 2k\gamma^{-2})}}{\Lambda^2C\gamma^2 + 2k}. \quad (34)$$

For

$$m^2\gamma^4 = 4Q^2C(\Lambda^2C + 2k\gamma^{-2}) \quad (35)$$

we get an extremal black hole, whereas for

$$m^2\gamma^4 < 4Q^2C(\Lambda^2C + 2k\gamma^{-2}) \quad (36)$$

we have a naked singularity. (The scalar curvature diverges like r^{-3} for $r \rightarrow 0$). The Hawking temperature is given by

$$T_H = -\frac{Q^2C}{2\pi\gamma^4r_+^2} + \frac{1}{8\pi}(\Lambda^2C + 2k\gamma^{-2}); \quad (37)$$

it vanishes in the extremal case (35). One can also compute the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, which reads

$$S_{BH} = \frac{\gamma^2r_+}{4}, \quad S_{BH} = \pi\gamma^2r_+, \quad (38)$$

for $k = 0$ and $k = 1$ respectively. The asymptotic behaviour of the found solutions is quite intriguing, as they are neither asymptotically anti-de Sitter nor asymptotically flat. Let us take e. g. the toroidal black hole solution

$$ds^2 = f(r)dt^2 - f(r)^{-1}dr^2 - \gamma^2r(dx^2 + dy^2), \quad (39)$$

where x, y are coordinates on the torus (periodically identified, $x \sim x + n$, $y \sim y + m$; $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$), and $f(r)$ is given by (33) with $k = 0$. For large r , (39) becomes

$$ds^2 = \frac{\Lambda^2Cr}{2}dt^2 - \frac{2}{\Lambda^2Cr}dr^2 - \gamma^2r(dx^2 + dy^2), \quad (40)$$

which is conformal to Minkowski space with conformal factor r . The manifold is globally hyperbolic (in both the toroidal and the spherical case), in contrast to common gauged supergravity backgrounds⁴. The Carter-Penrose diagrams of our black hole spacetimes are identical to that of the Reissner-Nordström black hole.

⁴Note, however, that also the non-abelian BPS magnetic monopole solution found in [5] is globally hyperbolic.

IV. SUPERSYMMETRIC STATES

A. The Toroidal Case

We now want to study if among the found solutions there are BPS states, i. e. states preserving some amount of supersymmetry. To begin with, we shall deal with the toroidal black hole (39). As the magnetic charges are required to vanish in this case, the consistency condition (21) for zero axion is automatically satisfied. Let us first consider the supertransformation (6) of the spin 1/2 fields. The condition that their variation be vanishing can be written as

$$\bar{\epsilon}(\mathcal{M}_1 + \alpha^3 \mathcal{M}_2 + \beta^3 \mathcal{M}_3) = 0, \quad (41)$$

where the $\mathcal{M}_i$ are 4×4 matrices given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_1 &= \frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} \gamma_1 + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} (e_A + i\gamma_5 e_B), \\ \mathcal{M}_2 &= \frac{Q_A}{\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \sigma_{01}, \\ \mathcal{M}_3 &= \frac{Q_B}{\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} i\gamma_5 \sigma_{01}. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Using the representation of α^3, β^3 given in [4], one can write (41) in the form

$$\bar{\epsilon} \Theta = 0, \quad (43)$$

the 16×16 matrix Θ being defined as

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} \Theta_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Theta_{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_1 & \mathcal{M}_2 \pm \mathcal{M}_3 \\ -(\mathcal{M}_2 \pm \mathcal{M}_3) & \mathcal{M}_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (44)$$

The necessary condition for the existence of Killing spinors $\bar{\epsilon}$ is thus $\det \Theta = 0$, or, equivalently

$$\det \Theta_+ = 0 \quad \vee \quad \det \Theta_- = 0. \quad (45)$$

The determinants read

$$\det \Theta_{\pm} = \frac{1}{(8\gamma^2 r^2)^4} (m^2 \gamma^4 - 4C^2 (e_B Q_A \mp e_A Q_B)^2)^2, \quad (46)$$

which yields

$$m^2 \gamma^4 = 4C^2 (e_B Q_A \mp e_A Q_B)^2. \quad (47)$$

As we have the inequality

$$(e_B Q_A \mp e_A Q_B)^2 \leq \Lambda^2 Q^2, \quad (48)$$

the configurations satisfying (47) are in general naked singularities, except for the one with

$$e_A Q_A \pm e_B Q_B = 0, \quad (49)$$

which saturates (48) and therefore represents an extremal black hole.

Without loss of generality we shall restrict ourselves to the upper sign in the foregoing equations, so that

$$\det \Theta_+ = 0, \quad \det \Theta_- \neq 0. \quad (50)$$

This then implies the constraint

$$\bar{\epsilon}(\alpha^3 - \beta^3) = 0 \quad (51)$$

on the Killing spinors.

Next we also have to impose that the gravitino variation (7) be vanishing. Using the fact that $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$, this condition can be simplified to

$$0 = \bar{\epsilon} \overleftarrow{\nabla}_\mu, \quad (52)$$

where the supercovariant derivative $\overleftarrow{\nabla}_\mu$ is defined by

$$\overleftarrow{\nabla}_\mu = \overleftarrow{D}_\mu - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \exp(-\phi) C_{\mu\rho} \gamma^\rho + \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\rho \phi) \gamma^\rho \gamma_\mu, \quad (53)$$

whose components read

$$\begin{aligned} \overleftarrow{\nabla}_t &= \overleftarrow{\partial}_t + \frac{1}{4} \left(f' - \frac{f}{r} \right) \gamma_0 \gamma_1 + \alpha^3 \left(\frac{e_A Q_A C}{2\gamma^2 r} + \frac{i Q_A}{\gamma^2} \sqrt{\frac{fC}{2r^3}} \gamma_1 \right) \\ &\quad \beta^3 \left(\frac{e_B Q_B C}{2\gamma^2 r} + \frac{i Q_B}{\gamma^2} \sqrt{\frac{fC}{2r^3}} i \gamma_5 \gamma_1 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

$$\overleftarrow{\nabla}_r = \overleftarrow{\partial}_r - \frac{1}{4r} + \alpha^3 \frac{i Q_A}{\gamma^2} \sqrt{\frac{C}{2fr^3}} \gamma_0 + \beta^3 \frac{i Q_B}{\gamma^2} \sqrt{\frac{C}{2fr^3}} i \gamma_5 \gamma_0, \quad (55)$$

$$\overleftarrow{\nabla}_x = \overleftarrow{\partial}_x, \quad (56)$$

$$\overleftarrow{\nabla}_y = \overleftarrow{\partial}_y. \quad (57)$$

(52) thus implies that Killing spinors, if they exist, are independent of the coordinates x, y , and therefore they automatically respect the identifications on the torus.

As no x, y -dependence occurs in $\overleftarrow{\nabla}_t$ and $\overleftarrow{\nabla}_r$, the only integrability condition following from (52) reads

$$\bar{\epsilon}[\overleftarrow{\nabla}_t, \overleftarrow{\nabla}_r] = 0. \quad (58)$$

One finds

$$[\overleftarrow{\nabla}_t, \overleftarrow{\nabla}_r] = -(\overleftarrow{\nabla}_t - \overleftarrow{\partial}_t) \frac{1}{r}, \quad (59)$$

and hence the integrability condition (58) together with

$$\bar{\epsilon} \overleftarrow{\nabla}_t = 0 \quad (60)$$

implies that the Killing spinors are also independent of t ,

$$\bar{\epsilon} \overleftarrow{\partial}_t = 0. \quad (61)$$

Next we consider condition (41) in more detail, in particular we will show that (58) follows completely from $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$. To this aim, we define the idempotents

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 &= \alpha^3 \frac{Q_A + i\gamma_5 Q_B}{iQ} \gamma_0, \\ \Gamma_2 &= i\alpha^3 \gamma_0 \gamma_1, \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

$$\Gamma_3 = \frac{e_A + i\gamma_5 e_B}{i\Lambda} \gamma_1. \quad (63)$$

Note that one has

$$\begin{aligned} [\Gamma_1, \Gamma_3] &= \frac{2i(e_A Q_A + e_B Q_B)}{\Lambda Q} \Gamma_2, \\ \{\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2\} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Using these definitions and the constraint (51), the equation $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$ reads

$$\bar{\epsilon} \left[-\frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} - \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_1 + \frac{i\Lambda}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_3 \right] = 0. \quad (65)$$

Consider now the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \left[-\frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} - \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_1 + \frac{i\Lambda}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_3 \right] \left[-\frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} - \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_1 - \frac{i\Lambda}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_3 \right] = \\ \left(-\frac{CQ^2}{2\gamma^4 r^3} + \frac{m}{8r^2} \right) [1 + x(r)\Gamma_1 + y(r)\Gamma_2], \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left[-\frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} - \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_1 + \frac{i\Lambda}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_3 \right] \left[-\frac{i}{2r} \sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} + \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_1 - \frac{i\Lambda}{4} \sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} \Gamma_3 \right] = \\ \frac{m}{4r^2} P(\gamma_5 \Gamma_2 \text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A)), \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x(r) &= \frac{2\sqrt{2frC}Q\gamma^2}{4CQ^2 - \gamma^4 mr}, \\ y(r) &= \frac{2iC(e_A Q_A + e_B Q_B)\gamma^2 r}{4CQ^2 - \gamma^4 mr}, \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

obeying

$$x^2 + y^2 = 1. \quad (69)$$

Furthermore we defined

$$P(\mathcal{L}) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \mathcal{L}), \quad (70)$$

for an idempotent operator $\mathcal{L}$ ($P(\mathcal{L})$ is then a projector). (69) implies that also $(1 + x\Gamma_1 + y\Gamma_2)/2$ is an (r -dependent) projection operator. One easily shows that

$$[(1 + x\Gamma_1 + y\Gamma_2)/2, P(\gamma_5\Gamma_2\text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A))] = 0. \quad (71)$$

Now, using the identities (66) and (67), one finds that (65) implies the two equations

$$\bar{\epsilon}[1 + x(r)\Gamma_1 + y(r)\Gamma_2] = 0, \quad (72)$$

$$\bar{\epsilon}P(\gamma_5\Gamma_2\text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A)) = 0. \quad (73)$$

It is easy to show that eq. (72) is equivalent to the (58), so the integrability condition follows entirely from $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$. Since the operator acting on $\bar{\epsilon}$ in (65) is itself a linear combination of the two operators occuring in (72) respectively (73),

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[-\frac{i}{2r}\sqrt{\frac{f}{2}} - \frac{iQ}{2\gamma^2 r}\sqrt{\frac{C}{r}}\Gamma_1 + \frac{i\Lambda}{4}\sqrt{\frac{C}{r}}\Gamma_3 \right] = \\ & \frac{1}{2i} \left(\frac{Q}{\gamma^2 r}\sqrt{\frac{C}{r}} - \frac{m\gamma^2}{4Q\sqrt{Cr}} \right) [1 + x(r)\Gamma_1 + y(r)\Gamma_2]\Gamma_1 \\ & + \frac{m\gamma^2}{4iQ\sqrt{Cr}} P(\gamma_5\Gamma_2\text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A))\Gamma_1, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

the equation $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$ is equivalent to the two conditions (72) and (73). Thus the only remaining equations to solve are these constraints, and the radial equation

$$\bar{\epsilon}\overleftarrow{\nabla}_r = 0, \quad (75)$$

with $\overleftarrow{\nabla}_r$ given by (55). Eq. (75) is of the form

$$\bar{\epsilon} \left[\overleftarrow{\partial}_r - a(r) - b(r)\Gamma_1 \right] = 0, \quad (76)$$

where we did not write down the functions $a(r)$ and $b(r)$ explicitly. The solution of a spinorial equation of this type, subject to constraints like (72) and (73), is given in the appendix of [28], and reads

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}_0 P(-\gamma_5\Gamma_2\text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A)) P(-\Gamma_1)(u(r) + v(r)\Gamma_2), \quad (77)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
u(r) &= \sqrt{4CQ^2 - \gamma^4 mr + 2\sqrt{2f r C} Q \gamma^2 r^{-1/4}}, \\
v(r) &= -\sqrt{4CQ^2 - \gamma^4 mr - 2\sqrt{2f r C} Q \gamma^2 r^{-1/4}},
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

and $\bar{\epsilon}_0$ denoting a constant spinor. Finally, we have to implement also the condition (51), which is equivalent to

$$\bar{\epsilon} P(\beta^3 \alpha^3) = 0. \tag{79}$$

This yields for the final version of the Killing spinors

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}_0 P(-\beta^3 \alpha^3) P(-\gamma_5 \Gamma_2 \text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A)) P(-\Gamma_1)(u(r) + v(r) \Gamma_2). \tag{80}$$

In the case of an extremal black hole, we have

$$e_A Q_A + e_B Q_B = 0, \tag{81}$$

(cf. (49)), and the Bogomol'nyi bound (47) reads

$$m^2 \gamma^4 = 4Q^2 C^2 \Lambda^2. \tag{82}$$

The Killing spinors (80) then simplify to

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}_0 P(-\beta^3 \alpha^3) P(-\gamma_5 \Gamma_2 \text{sign}(e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A)) P(\Gamma_1) f(r)^{1/4}. \tag{83}$$

The three projectors appearing in (80) and (83) reduce the dimension of the solution space from sixteen to two, enough for a residual N=1 supersymmetry. For vanishing electric charges, $Q = 0$, (47) implies $m = 0$, in which case the metric reduces to (40). This space represents the background of our black hole solutions. Then $\delta \bar{\chi} = 0$ takes the simple form

$$\bar{\epsilon} P(\Gamma_3) = 0, \tag{84}$$

i. e. in the uncharged case it is not necessary to decompose $\delta \bar{\chi} = 0$ into two independent projection conditions, as we were forced to do for the charged configurations. The radial equation (75) reads

$$\bar{\epsilon} \left[\overleftarrow{\partial}_r - \frac{1}{4r} \right] = 0. \tag{85}$$

This yields for the Killing spinors

$$\bar{\epsilon} = \bar{\epsilon}_0 P(-\Gamma_3) r^{1/4}. \tag{86}$$

The number of Killing spinors is thus enhanced from two to eight, corresponding to an N=2 supersymmetry algebra, which means that the background preserves one half of the supersymmetries. This background is identical to the domain wall solution found in [10,11]. Another special case occurs if

$$e_A Q_B \mp e_B Q_A = 0, \tag{87}$$

for which we also have $m = 0$ from (47). Similarly to the situation for $Q = 0$ described above, $\delta\bar{\chi} = 0$ is itself a projection condition, doubling this time the number of linearly independent Killing spinors from two to four⁵, which corresponds to a residual N=1 supersymmetry.

B. The Spherical Case

Let us now consider the configurations with topology $\mathbb{R}^2 \times S^2$. The spacetime metric is then

$$ds^2 = f(r)dt^2 - f(r)^{-1}dr^2 - \gamma^2 r(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \quad (88)$$

where $f(r)$ is given by (33) with $k = 1$.

Again we first require that the variation of the spin 1/2 fields be vanishing. One can then proceed like in the toroidal case, and gets for the determinants $\det \Theta_{\pm}$

$$\begin{aligned} \det \Theta_{\pm} = \frac{1}{(8\gamma^4 r^2)^4} & \left[-(m\gamma^4 \pm 4(H_B Q_A - H_A Q_B))^2 + 16H^4(Q_A e_B \mp Q_B e_A)^2 \right. \\ & \left. + 16\gamma^2 r(Q_A e_B \mp Q_B e_A)(H_A e_A \pm H_B e_B)H^2 + 4\gamma^4 r^2(H_A e_A \pm H_B e_B)^2 \right]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

These determinants must vanish identically as functions of r , which yields

$$(m\gamma^4 \pm 4(H_B Q_A - H_A Q_B))^2 = 16H^4(Q_A e_B \mp Q_B e_A)^2, \quad (90)$$

$$H_A e_A \pm H_B e_B = 0. \quad (91)$$

Again, without loss of generality we may restrict ourselves to the upper sign in the previous equations. Then we have

$$\det \Theta_+ = 0, \quad \det \Theta_- \neq 0, \quad (92)$$

yielding the constraint (51). Now, one of the various integrability conditions for Killing spinors, following from (52), reads

$$\bar{\epsilon}[\overleftarrow{\nabla}_{\theta}, \overleftarrow{\nabla}_{\varphi}] = 0, \quad (93)$$

where the supercovariant derivatives are determined by (53). Using (51), (32) and (91), one gets

$$\bar{\epsilon}[\overleftarrow{\nabla}_{\theta}, \overleftarrow{\nabla}_{\varphi}] = \bar{\epsilon}\alpha^3 \frac{i \cos \theta}{\sqrt{2C}\gamma} (H_A + i\gamma_5 H_B)\gamma_2. \quad (94)$$

Now the determinant of the matrix acting on $\bar{\epsilon}$ in (94) is zero iff the magnetic charges H_A and H_B vanish, i. e. $H = 0$. This is, however, incompatible with (32). This means that among

⁵Note that e. g. for $e_A Q_B - e_B Q_A = m = 0$, one has $\det \Theta_+ = 0$, and $\det \Theta_- \neq 0$, so one still needs the constraint (51), whereas for $Q = m = 0$ we have $\det \Theta_+ = \det \Theta_- = 0$, so (51) can be dropped.

the spherical solutions we have found, there is no configuration preserving some amount of supersymmetry. Note that this behaviour is similar to that of the Freedman-Gibbons solutions [8], where only the $\text{AdS}_2 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ configurations (or $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^1 \times S^1$, if one compactifies the real plane to a torus) can yield BPS states, whereas the $\text{AdS}_2 \times S^2$ solutions break all supersymmetries.

C. Nonvanishing Axion

We now want to give a short comment on the issue in which way our considerations can be generalized to the case of nonzero axion. It is well-known that the ungauged version of $N=4$, $D=4$ supergravity considered in [25] has, apart from the $SU(4)$ invariance group, an additional $SU(1, 1)$ symmetry of the equations of motion. Of this symmetry, however, only an $U(1)$ subgroup survives in the gauged version, namely the group of transformations [4]

$$\eta(x) \rightarrow \eta(x) + c, \quad (95)$$

c being a real constant⁶. As only the derivatives of $\eta(x)$ enter the supersymmetry transformation laws (6) and (7), this represents a rather trivial generalization; it means that the BPS states found above remain supersymmetric if the axion, instead of being zero, assumes a constant value. (Note that also the axionic equation of motion (12) remains satisfied, provided the consistency condition (13) is fulfilled). Hence there seems to be no way of using duality symmetries to create nontrivial axionic solutions in an efficient manner, so we shall leave the search for the latter for future investigations.

V. INTERPRETATION AS BPS STRING- AND M-THEORY SOLUTIONS

Finally, we would like to use the Kaluza-Klein interpretation of gauged $N=4$, $D=4$ $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity given by Chamseddine and Volkov [5,6], to lift our BPS configurations to ten and eleven dimensions. In doing so, we could regard them as supersymmetric solutions of the low energy effective action of string- or M-theory. The details of the compactification of $N=1$ supergravity in ten dimensions on the group manifold $S^3 \times S^3$ are given in [5], so we shall not repeat them here. We adopt the index convention used in [5], i. e. greek, latin, and capital latin indices refer to the four-dimensional, internal six-dimensional ($S^3 \times S^3$), and ten-dimensional spaces, respectively. Early letters relate to the tangent space, whereas the late ones denote world indices. Furthermore we parametrize the six internal coordinates by a pair of indices, that is $\{m\} = \{(s), i\}$, with $s = 1, 2$ (specifying the three-sphere) and $i = 1, 2, 3$, and similarly for the tangent space, $\{a\} = \{(s), a\}$, where $a = 1, 2, 3$. Performing the inverse of the dimensional reduction described in [5], we arrive at the ten-dimensional metric (in Einstein-frame)⁷

⁶Actually, (95) is a global invariance of the action, the additional term appearing due to c being a total derivative because of the Bianchi identities $\partial_\mu(V\tilde{A}^{\mu\nu}) = \partial_\mu(V\tilde{B}^{\mu\nu}) = 0$.

⁷Our conventions differ from those used in [5] by $\phi \rightarrow -\phi$.

$$d\hat{s}^2 = \exp(3\phi/2)ds^2 - 2\exp(-\phi/2)(\Theta^{(1)a}\Theta^{(1)a} + \Theta^{(2)a}\Theta^{(2)a}), \quad (96)$$

where ds^2 denotes the four-dimensional line element, and the forms $\Theta^{(s)a}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^{(1)a} &= A^a + \frac{\theta^{(1)a}}{e_A}, \\ \Theta^{(2)a} &= B^a + \frac{\theta^{(2)a}}{e_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (97)$$

Here A^a and B^a are the gauge potentials occuring in (2) and (3), and the $\theta^{(s)a}$ denote the Maurer-Cartan forms on S^3 satisfying

$$d\theta^{(s)a} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{abc}\theta^{(s)b} \wedge \theta^{(s)c} = 0. \quad (98)$$

Explicitely, they read

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^1 &= \cos\psi d\vartheta + \sin\psi \sin\vartheta d\varphi, \\ \theta^2 &= -\sin\psi d\vartheta + \cos\psi \sin\vartheta d\varphi, \\ \theta^3 &= d\psi + \cos\vartheta d\varphi, \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

ψ, ϑ, φ being the Euler angles on the three-sphere.

Finally, we also need to give the ten-dimensional dilaton $\hat{\phi}$, and the antisymmetric tensor field $\hat{H}_{MNP}$ appearing in N=1, D=10 supergravity. For the former, we obtain

$$\hat{\phi} = \frac{\phi}{2} = \frac{\phi_0}{2} - \frac{1}{4}\ln r, \quad (100)$$

while the non-vanishing components of the latter read

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_{\alpha\beta a} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\exp(-5\phi/4)F_{\alpha\beta}^a, \\ \hat{H}_{abc} &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\exp(3\phi/4)f_{abc}, \end{aligned} \quad (101)$$

where we defined

$$F_{\alpha\beta}^{(1)a} = A_{\alpha\beta}^a, \quad F_{\alpha\beta}^{(2)a} = B_{\alpha\beta}^a, \quad (102)$$

and the f_{abc} are the SU(2) gauge group structure constants,

$$f_{abc} \equiv f_{abc}^{(s)} = e_s \epsilon_{abc}, \quad s = A, B. \quad (103)$$

The ten-dimensional metric (96) has a rather complicated form, in particular we note that the four-dimensional gauge fields now give rise to off-diagonal components of the metric. (96) is different from known brane-like solutions of ten-dimensional supergravity, and it also does not seem to be an intersection of branes. However, asymptotically, i. e. for $r \rightarrow \infty$, the metric approaches a simple form. To see this, we write the line element (96) in string frame,

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \exp(\hat{\phi}) d\hat{s}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \exp(2\phi) ds^2 - \Theta^{(1)a} \Theta^{(1)a} - \Theta^{(2)a} \Theta^{(2)a}. \quad (104)$$

Now introduce the new coordinates

$$\tau = \frac{\Lambda C}{2} t, \quad \rho = \frac{\ln r}{\Lambda}, \quad X = \sqrt{\frac{C}{2}} \gamma x, \quad Y = \sqrt{\frac{C}{2}} \gamma y. \quad (105)$$

This yields for the metric (104) in the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$

$$d\tilde{s}^2 = d\tau^2 - d\rho^2 - dX^2 - dY^2 - \frac{1}{e_A^2} \theta^{(1)a} \theta^{(1)a} - \frac{1}{e_B^2} \theta^{(2)a} \theta^{(2)a}. \quad (106)$$

Asymptotically, our BPS configurations thus approach (in string frame) $M^2 \times S^1 \times S^1 \times S^3 \times S^3$, where M^2 denotes two-dimensional Minkowski space, and the radii of the three-spheres are given by $1/e_A$ and $1/e_B$. (106) arises also for vanishing gauge fields and mass parameter. If we do not consider the X, Y -directions as compactified, we recognize (106) to be the near-horizon limit of the intersection of two NS five-branes on a line. This supersymmetric solution of N=1, D=10 supergravity has previously been considered in [29]. Upon compactification on $S^3 \times S^3$, it gives rise to the domain wall solution of the FS model.

One can further lift the solutions to eleven dimensions, to regard them in the context of M-theory. Using the rules of [5], one obtains for the metric

$$ds_{(11)}^2 = \exp(4\phi/3) ds^2 - 2 \exp(-2\phi/3) (\Theta^{(1)a} \Theta^{(1)a} + \Theta^{(2)a} \Theta^{(2)a}) - \exp(4\phi/3) dx^{(10)} dx^{(10)}, \quad (107)$$

and for the antisymmetric tensor field

$$A_{MN10} = C_{MN}, \quad A_{MNP} = 0, \quad (108)$$

where C_{MN} is the two-form potential appearing in ten dimensions, which gives rise to the field strength H_{MNP} via $H = dC$.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, we have obtained several new multi-parameter solutions of the bosonic sector of gauged N=4, D=4 $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity. These configurations generalize in a certain sense the Freedman-Gibbons solutions [8], in that they are not simply direct product spacetimes, but rather warped products. Furthermore the dilaton is no more constant, it depends on the radial coordinate r . The obtained spacetimes represent toroidal or spherical black holes respectively naked singularities, depending on the parameters. The spherical solutions break all supersymmetries, whereas in the toroidal case we found BPS configurations preserving one quarter of the supersymmetries, in particular, we found an extremal BPS black hole. We further showed that the background of the toroidal spacetimes, which is obtained if the mass and the two electric charges of the black hole are set to zero, breaks only half of the supersymmetries, and corresponds to the domain wall solution of the FS model. In all cases, the Killing spinors depend only on the radial coordinate r .

We have also used the Kaluza-Klein interpretation of gauged $N=4$, $D=4$ $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ supergravity to lift our configurations to ten and eleven dimensions, so that they can be regarded as solutions of the low energy effective action of type I- or heterotic string-theory or of M-theory. The lifted metrics result to have a rather complicated form, with off-diagonal elements coming from the four-dimensional gauge fields. However, for $r \rightarrow \infty$ the ten-dimensional line element asymptotes in string frame to a simple product spacetime $M^2 \times S^1 \times S^1 \times S^3 \times S^3$ (endowed with standard metric), which is equivalent to the near-horizon limit of the intersection of two NS five-branes on a line. It would be very tempting to try to use the powerful tools of string- and M-theory in order to give a microscopic interpretation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of the four-dimensional extremal toroidal BPS black hole.

As it is well known that $N=2$, $D=7$ gauged supergravity can be obtained by compactifying $N=1$, $D=10$ supergravity on a three-sphere (cf. e. g. [29]), the solutions found in our paper also give rise to new supersymmetric black holes in the $SU(2)$ gauged seven-dimensional theory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work has been supported by a research grant within the scope of the *Common Special Academic Program III* of the Federal Republic of Germany and its Federal States, mediated by the DAAD.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. M. Maldacena, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 231.
- [2] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 253.
- [3] E. Witten, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2** (1998) 505.
- [4] D. Z. Freedman and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **137**, 333 (1978).
- [5] A. H. Chamseddine and M. S. Volkov, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 6242 (1998).
- [6] A. H. Chamseddine, *Plenary talk given at the PASCOS-98 meeting at Northeastern University, Boston, March 21-29, 1998*, hep-th/9806181.
- [7] A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **379**, 99 (1996).
- [8] D. Z. Freedman and G. W. Gibbons, Nucl. Phys. B **233**, 24 (1984).
- [9] I. Antoniadis, C. Bachas, and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **235**, 255 (1990).
- [10] P. M. Cowdall, Class. Quantum Grav. **15**, 2937 (1998).
- [11] H. Singh, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 304 (1998).
- [12] H. Singh, hep-th/9808181.
- [13] K. Behrndt, A. H. Chamseddine, and W. A. Sabra, hep-th/9807187.
- [14] K. Behrndt, M. Cvetič, and W. A. Sabra, hep-th/9810227.
- [15] S. Åminneborg, I. Bengtsson, S. Holst, and P. Peldán, Class. Quantum Grav. **13**, 2707 (1996).
- [16] R. B. Mann, Class. Quantum Grav. **14**, L109 (1997);
R. B. Mann, gr-qc/9709039 (1997);
R. B. Mann and W. L. Smith, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 4942 (1997).
- [17] J. P. S. Lemos, Class. Quantum Grav. **12**, 1081 (1995);
J. P. S. Lemos, Phys. Lett. B **353**, 46 (1996);
J. P. S. Lemos and V. T. Zanchin, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 3840 (1996).
- [18] R. G. Cai and Y. Z. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 4891 (1996).
- [19] C. G. Huang and C. B. Liang, Phys. Lett. A **201**, 27 (1995);
C. G. Huang, Acta Phys. Sin. **4**, 617 (1996).
- [20] L. Vanzo, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6475 (1997).
- [21] A. Das, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2805 (1977).
- [22] E. Cremmer and J. Scherk, Nucl. Phys. B **127**, 259 (1977).
- [23] A. Das, M. Fischler, and M. Roček, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 3427 (1977).
- [24] S. J. Gates and B. Zwiebach, Phys. Lett. B **123**, 200 (1983).
- [25] E. Cremmer, J. Scherk, and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. B **74**, 61 (1978).
- [26] K. C. K. Chan, J. H. Horne, and R. B. Mann, Nucl. Phys. B **447**, 441 (1995).
- [27] R. G. Cai, J. Y. Ji, and K. S. Soh, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 6547 (1998).
- [28] L. J. Romans, Nucl. Phys. B **383**, 395 (1992).
- [29] P. M. Cowdall and P. K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 281 (1998);
Erratum-ibid. B**434**, 458 (1998).